

Serial No. 09/661,273

- 15 -

Art Unit: 2155

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-55 are pending in this application. All claims were rejected based on Garrity in view of Rosser, or that combination in view of Dobbins. Claims 1, 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 are currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The presently claimed invention distinguishes the cited combinations because: (1) access control information is moved closer to the host; and (2) the access control information is moved prior to the time when it is required for authorization purposes. The Office asserted that feature (1) above was not recited in the rejected claims. Although Applicant disagrees, the claims have been amended to further emphasize this distinguishing feature. For example, claim 1 now recites "distributing multicast group access control information from a distribution device to a plurality of access devices for use by the access devices in authenticating subsequent requests by individual host devices to join a television channel multicast group, wherein each access device is logically closer to the host device from which the access device receives the request than the distribution device." Claims 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 now include similar language. Since this feature is not suggested by the cited combination, nor has the Office suggested that it is, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 is requested. Claims 2-14, 16-24, 26-34, 36-44, and 46-54 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention, and which are allowable for the same reasons stated above with regard to their respective base claims.

The Office asserted that feature (2) above is taught by Garrity. In particular, the Office took the position that some or all of Garrity's user profile, enabling keys and viewer usage profile are equivalent to the presently claimed access control information. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited passages of Garrity describe those elements as being used to narrowcast to the subscriber. For example, the user profile and enabling keys may be used to insert selected

Serial No. 09/661,273

- 16 -

Art Unit: 2155

video such as targeted advertisement. There is no authorization step in the narrowcast, and hence no authorization information. In contrast, the presently claims access control information is used for authorization purposes in order to determine whether a subscriber device is permitted to receive a particular channel. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 is therefore once again requested. Claims 2-14, 16-24, 26-34, 36-44, and 46-54 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention, and which are allowable for the same reasons sated above with regard to their respective base claims.

Applicants assert that a sufficient motivation to combine the cited references has not been shown. A *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 must include a showing of a suggestion, teaching or motivation that would have led a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the cited references *in the particular manner claimed*. See In re Dembiczak, 175 F.3d 994, 998 (Fed. Cir. 1999), and In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2000). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In this case, the Office has not established that a person or ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the cited combinations of references in the particular manner of the corresponding rejected claims.

Serial No. 09/661,273

- 17 -


Art Unit: 2155

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Holmes W. Anderson, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-4001 (X305) so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

July 27, 2005  
Date

  
Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Steubing McGuinness & Manaras LLP  
125 Nagog Park  
Acton, MA 01720  
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-194

Dd: 8/6/2005